Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/657,610	JIANG ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Timothy C. Vanoy	1754
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) Timothy C. Vanoy.	(3)	
(2) Mr. Philip Von Neida, applicants' attorney.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 10 February 2006	Time: <u>1:25 pm</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Appl Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	icant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: none		
Claims discussed: 22		
Prior art documents discussed: none		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GEN See Continuation Sheet	IERAL NATURE OF WHAT WA	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.	•	
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview 		
did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.		
Timothy C Vange		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applica	ant/Applicant's Representative S	ignature – if appropriate)

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-413B)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner proposed amending claim 22 by replacing "into said reactor, feeding" with "," in line 3 via an Examiner's Amendment. Examiner proposed amending claim 22 by deleting "into said reactor," and also deleting "feeding" in line 4 via an Examiner's Amendment. The attorney authorized entry of these proposed examiner's amendments..